REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 14, 15, 17-20, 22-23, 25-28, 30-31, 33, and 39- 43 were presented for examination. In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 - 3, 5, 8, 18 - 20, 22, 23, 25, 39 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakakibara ('517). Claims 9 - 11, 14, 15, 17, 26 - 28, 30, 31, 33, 40, 41 and 43 were allowed. Claim 6 was objected to. However, Claim 6 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this paper, Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 5 and 6 and Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled. Claim 18 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 22 and 23 and Claims 22 and 23 have been canceled. Claim 39 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 5 and 6. Claim 42 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 22 and 23. Applicants Attorney made other minor changes in the Claims with respect to the recitation of first and second temperature The Title, Summary and Abstract have been amended per the Examiner's threshold. suggestions.

Claims 1 - 3 and 8 should now be allowable.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 23. Examiner asserted that in column 5, lines 18 - 31, Sakakibara discloses the subject matter of Claim 23. However, no such teaching is provided in Sakakibara. In addition, Claim 23 is drafted along the lines of Claim 6. Hence, Claim 23 should have been allowable for the same reason given for the allowance of Claim 6. Accordingly, Claims 18, the claims dependent thereon and Claim 42 should be allowable.

Reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are therefore respectfully requested.

> Respectfully submitted, D. Wolin, et al.

William J. Benman
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,014

WJB/lc

Benman, Brown & Williams 2049 Century Park East Suite 2740 Los Angeles, CA 90067

310-553-2400 310-553-2675 (fax)